

Minutes
AIMS Task Force
Wednesday, October 22, 2008

The AIMS Task Force held a meeting at the Arizona Department of Education, 1535 West Jefferson, Room 417, Phoenix, Arizona. The meeting was called to order at 9:32 AM.

Members Present:

Dr. Jim Zaharis
Dr. Deborah Gonzales
Mr. Chuck Essigs
Ms. Melinda Jensen
Dr. Joe O'Reilly
Dr. Alan Storm

Members Absent:

Dr. Charles Santa Cruz

1. Call to order

Dr. Zaharis called the meeting to order and explained that the purpose of the meeting would be to clarify the procedures for future meetings and to organize Task Force's work over the coming months.

2. Roll call

Mr. Yanez called the role. Attendance is noted above.

3. Introduction of Task Force members

Dr. Zaharis asked the Task Force members to introduce themselves.

Ms. Melinda Jensen is a teacher at Empire High School in the Vial School District. Ms. Jensen teaches math and is also the achievement teacher and coordinates the data for AIMS.

Dr. Gonzalez is the Assistant Superintendent for the Phoenix Union High School District for Curriculum and Instruction.

Dr. O'Reilly is the Executive Director for Student Achievement Support for the Mesa School District.

Mr. Essigs is the Director of Government Relations for the Arizona Association of School Business Officials.

Dr. Storm is the Superintendent of the Pima County Joint Technological Education District.

Dr. Zaharis is the Vice-President of the Greater Phoenix Leadership. Dr. Zaharis stated for the record that Dr. Charles Santa Cruz, who was not present, is the principal of Gilbert High School.

Dr. Zaharis introduced Mr. Vince Yanez to explain how the AIMS Task Force was created.

Mr. Yanez explained the legislative history and the specific charge of the Task Force. He stated that the State Board of Education was responsible for making appointments to the AIMS Task Force. He provided a general overview of the provisions outlined in HB2211.

Dr. Zaharis asked Mr. Yanez to introduce the work of Dr. Garcia and how he will work with the Task Force.

Mr. Yanez explained that due to the amount of information that would be presented to the Task Force over the next several months, Dr. David Garcia from Arizona State University, was asked to assist and facilitate with this project. Mr. Yanez stated that Dr. Garcia brings outstanding experience and expertise in the area of assessment.

Dr. Zaharis introduced Dr. Garcia and stated graduate students from ASU would also be assisting Dr. Garcia in the process.

Dr. Garcia introduced one of the graduate students who will be helping with this project and explained how the report will be developed. Research will be used to help the decisions of the members. A packet of information (research) will be provided to each member approximately one week prior to scheduled meetings. This research will include one page summaries for each article that will provide key research questions, major findings, policy implications, and other relevant issues.

4. Presentation and discussion regarding Task Force operations and work strategies. discussion may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Review of authorizing legislation and Task Force responsibilities
- Member expectations and identification of topics of interest
- Task Force processes and other operational considerations
- Future meeting dates and agendas

Dr. Garcia referred to the handout with the timeline information. The proposed topics introduced to the members are to help guide the discussions. Dr. Garcia stated that his strategy is to have specific times designated to cover the major topics the Task Force must address. He stated that it is necessary to have the topics scheduled out in advance so that he and his students are able to prepare the necessary material.

Dr. Garcia reviewed the proposed topics for the November 12th meeting and future meetings.

Dr. Storm asked if AIMS-A would be a topic of the work that will be developed.

Mr. Yanez explained the two primary elements that the Task Force is to look at are: AIMS as a graduation requirement and the incorporation a college entrance exam. Therefore those are the two main objectives of the work of the Task Force. Although, Mr. Yanez

noted that the language in HB 2211 allows for some leeway for the discussion of other areas of the assessment system. Mr. Yanez stated that it is important that the Task Force prioritize the main objectives, as described in the law.

Dr. Zaharis stated that he would like for the members to add the topics they would like to see discussed. Dr. Zaharis also said that although the final report is due in June he would like to have the work completed by March.

Dr. O'Reilly asked to focus on the high school assessments. Work place skills should also be looked at.

Dr. Zaharis agreed that the topics of high school exit college entrance exams and the definitions of college readiness, college entrance requirements and career readiness. The topics will be discussed.

Dr. O'Reilly asked for clarification of the deadline to submit the final report.

Dr. Zaharis explained that the official timeline to complete the report is June of 2009; the Task Force will work internally to complete the report by March but the expectation should be June.

Ms. Jensen asked that the Task Force be provided with the testing requirements as set forth in NCLB. She specifically noted that this would be important information when the Task Force begins its discussions surrounding the ACT and SAT. She also stressed the importance of understanding the requirements relating to criterion reference vs. norm referenced tests.

Dr. Gonzalez concurred with Ms. Jensen. She also expressed her concerns that the Task Force would not be able to come to a consensus around the purposes of assessment in a single meeting. She suggested that more time may be necessary.

Dr. Zaharis asked if the members agreed with proposed calendar, and addressed Mr. Yanez to discuss the possible locations for the various meetings.

Mr. Yanez stated that the possibility of moving the meetings off site was discussed; NAU has offered their facilities in Phoenix and other locations in central Phoenix are also being considered. The location for the November 12th meeting has not been confirmed but the information will be posted as soon as possible.

Dr. Storm suggested the School Facilities Board for possible meeting locations and to consider a meeting to be held in the Tucson area.

Mr. Yanez stated that all locations would be considered and posted far in advanced for the members and public.

Dr. Zaharis stated he would like to have a higher education review committee in order to align the set of recommendation with other work being developed by the state's P-20 Council. Dr. Zaharis also asked for a "What Is Statement," that provides current information. He asked for this information to be provided at the next meeting.

Dr. Zaharis asked if members had any other comments.

Ms. Jensen stated that February 25th was AIMS administration date. Dr. Zaharis said the AIMS Task Force meeting scheduled would be moved.

Dr. Zaharis asked the members and Dr. Garcia if there were any other calendar constraints.

There were no other calendar constraints.

Dr. Garcia explained that research would be provided per state to show how Arizona fits nationally.

Dr. Zaharis asked that AIMS Augmentation be included on the “What Is Statement” and referred to all of the topics listed on the draft timeline.

Mr. Yanez asked to review operational norms to be considered. As a matter of staffing the State Board staff will be assisting with the facilitation of meetings.

Mr. Essigs suggested that public should be encouraged to speak at a meeting rather than have individual meetings.

Dr. Garcia asked if he would have the Task Force approval to request information on behalf of the members. Dr. Zaharis stated he encourages the collaboration with the Department of Education.

Ms. Pollock explained the main open meeting laws and most important points of what is expected for the Task Force members.

Dr. Zaharis asked Mr. Yanez for a contact list with Ms. Pollock’s information and staff the members may contact for further information.

5. Call to the public

No public comment was received.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:57 a.m.

